



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/735,317	12/11/2003	Richard Kardeis	5497-67127	6017
24197	7590	03/23/2006		
KLARQUIST SPARKMAN, LLP 121 SW SALMON STREET SUITE 1600 PORTLAND, OR 97204			EXAMINER HEWITT, JAMES M	
			ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
			3679	
DATE MAILED: 03/23/2006				

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Response to Amendment

The reply filed on 12/27/05 is not fully responsive to the prior Office Action because of the following omission(s) or matter(s):

The reply does not reply to the objection to claim 17 as noted on page 5 or the objection of claims 1-31 under 37 CFR 1.75(i) as noted on page 6.

Also, the reply does not present arguments pointing out the specific distinctions believed to render the claims, including any newly presented claims, patentable over Earle et al and Lee et al. Claims 4 and 5 were indicated as being allowable in the prior Office Action. In the reply, Applicant canceled claims 4 and 5 and incorporated a portion of each of claims 4 and 5 into claim 1, and also replaced "locking element" with "plate" in claim 1. As such, Applicant is required to present arguments pointing out the specific distinctions believed to render claim 1 patentable over Earle et al and Lee et al. Claim 14 was indicated as being allowable in the prior Office Action, yet as Applicant replaced "locking element" with "plate" and deleted a phrase therein, Applicant is required to present arguments pointing out the specific distinctions believed to render claim 14 patentable over Earle et al and Lee et al. Claim 7 was indicated as being allowable in the prior Office Action. In the reply, Applicant rewrote most of and not all of claim 7 as independent claim 35. As such, Applicant is required to present arguments pointing out the specific distinctions believed to render claim 35 patentable over Earle et al and Lee et al. See 37 CFR 1.111.

Since the above-mentioned reply appears to be *bona fide*, applicant is given **ONE (1) MONTH or THIRTY (30) DAYS** from the mailing date of this notice, whichever

Art Unit: 3679


is longer, within which to supply the omission or correction in order to avoid abandonment. EXTENSIONS OF THIS TIME PERIOD MAY BE GRANTED UNDER 37 CFR 1.136(a).

Note also that the replacement abstract is held to be non-compliant under 37 CFR 1.121, which requires a replacement abstract to include markings to show all changes relative to the immediate prior version.

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to James M. Hewitt whose telephone number is 571-272-7084.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Daniel Stodola can be reached on 571-272-7087. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).


JAMES M. HEWITT
PRIMARY EXAMINER